Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18 and 20-23 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 8, 14 and 16 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 16 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1-10, 14, 16-18, 20, and 23

Claims 1-10, 14, 16-18, 20, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,192,340 to Abecassis ("Abecassis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,996,015 to Day et al. ("Day"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,244 to Roy ("Roy").

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, "authenticating said multimedia device, and determining whether said multimedia device is authorized to access said plurality of multimedia clips" and "if said multimedia device has been authenticated and is authorized to access said plurality of multimedia clips, generating a menu for selecting one or more specific clips from said plurality of selectable multimedia clips for playing by said multimedia device." The combination of Abecassis, Day, and Roy does not teach or suggest at least these features recited in independent claim 1.

The Examiner concedes on page 3 of the Office Action that the primary citation to "Abecassis does not explicitly indicate…the multimedia device is authenticated prior to granting access to said plurality of multimedia clips." Nevertheless, the Examiner contends that "Roy teaches a system with a client and server where the client receives multimedia content and clips from the server (Column 2, lines 25-36) where the server authenticates the user's request for multimedia clips before the client can gain access (Column 5, lines 5-7)." (Office Action, p. 4.)

Roy is specifically directed to a multimedia bridge for allowing parties to participate in a multimedia conference "using their own respective user devices." (Roy, col. 2, ll. 16-47.) To setup a multimedia conference, Roy discloses that a user device sends a multimedia conference request, which includes the identity of the user device, to the multimedia bridge. (*Id.* at col. 4, ll. 40-44, 61-65.) The multimedia bridge examines the multimedia conference request to determine "whether the request is valid and/or has proper authorization." (*Id.* at col. 5, ll. 5-9.) If the multimedia conference request is not valid and/or authorized, the multimedia bridge will send a rejection message to the user device attempting to begin the multimedia conference. (*Id.*)

Although Roy examines the multimedia conference request to determine whether the request has proper authorization, Roy does not disclose that the examination further includes *authenticating* the request.[1] Thus, in this instance, Roy provides authorization

---

[1] Applicant notes that "authentication" is "[t]he process of proving that a subject (e.g., a user or a system) is what the subject claims to be." *Computer Security Basics*, Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly & Associates, 1991, p. 405. Thus, examination of a request as disclosed in Roy cannot be equated with authentication because mere "examination" does not necessarily involve proving that the request is what it claims to be.

without authentication.[2]   In complete contrast, claim 1 recites "authenticating said multimedia device, and determining whether said multimedia device is authorized to access said plurality of multimedia clips." Before the multimedia device of claim 1 is given access to the plurality of multimedia clips, it is authenticated *and* authorized. Roy does not teach or suggest such a feature.

Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that Roy authenticates the multimedia conference request prior to granting authorization (which it does not), authenticating a multimedia conference *request* is not sufficient to teach authenticating *a multimedia device* as recited in claim 1.

Day does not supply the missing teaching. Day is directed to a method for seamlessly joining together a plurality of multimedia files "prior to file delivery from a server library to network clients to enable a continuous and uninterrupted flow of multimedia data and a corresponding seamless video presentation of the selected files." (Day, col. 2, ll. 28-36.) Like Abecassis and Roy, Day does not teach or suggest authenticating said multimedia device, and determining whether said multimedia device is authorized to access said plurality of multimedia clips" and "if said multimedia device has been authenticated and is authorized to access said plurality of multimedia clips, generating a menu for selecting one or more specific clips from said plurality of selectable multimedia clips for playing by said multimedia device" as recited by Applicant's claim 1.

---

[2] Applicant notes that authorization is "[t]he granting of rights to a user, a program, or a process." *Computer Security Basics*, Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly & Associates, 1991, p. 405. As is evident by this definition, authorization does not require prior authentication of the thing for which rights are to be granted. Thus, just because something is authorized, or obtains authorization, does not necessarily mean that it was authenticated.

Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 for at least the reason that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Claims 2-6, 17, 18, 20, and 23 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1, and further in view of their own features, claims 2-6, 17, 18, 20, and 23 are patentable over Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-6, 17, 18, 20, and 23 be reconsidered and withdrawn

Independent claim 7 recites, among other features, "receiving access to said stored plurality of multimedia clips in response to said media server authenticating said multimedia device and authorizing said multimedia device to access said stored plurality of multimedia clips." As noted above in regard to claim 1, Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 7. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 7 be reconsidered and withdrawn

Independent claim 8 recites, among other features, "wherein said media server is configured to receive input of said user request for multimedia clips from said multimedia device and to generate a playlist file based on said user's request if said multimedia device has been authenticated and is authorized to access said multimedia clips." As noted above in regard to claim 1, Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 8. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 be reconsidered and withdrawn

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8. For at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 8, and further in view of their own features, claims 9 and 10 are patentable over Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9 and 10 be reconsidered and withdrawn

Independent claim 14 recites, among other features, "wherein said media server is configured to authenticate said multimedia device and determine whether said multimedia device is authorized to access said plurality of centrally stored multimedia clips." As noted above in regard to claim 1, Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 14. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 14 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 16 recites, among other features, "means for providing authentication information to the at least one media server and for receiving access to said stored plurality of multimedia clips in response to said media server authenticating said multimedia device and authorizing said multimedia device to receive access to said stored plurality of multimedia clips." As noted above in regard to claim 1, Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 16. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 16 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 13

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Abecassis, in view of Day, in view of Roy, and in further view of

U.S. Patent No. 6,446,096 to Holland et al. ("Holland"). Claims 12 and 13 depend from independent claim 8 and include the features recited therein. Holland does not overcome the deficiencies of Abecassis, Day, and Roy relative to independent claim 8 described above. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 12 and 13 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 21 and 22

Claims 21 and 22 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Abecassis, in view of Day, in view of Roy, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,479,536 to Comerford ("Comerford"). Claims 21 and 22 depend from independent claims 1 and 16, respectively, and includes the features recited therein. Comerford does not overcome the deficiencies of Abecassis, Day, and Roy relative to independent claims 1 and 16 described above. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 21 and 22 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests **that** the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,013

Date: ___10/20/10___

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
870736_1.DOC

Atty. Dkt. No. 1875.0030001